

QUESTIONS from 1st PUBLIC DRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY INFORMATION SESSION

APRIL 11, 2012 St. John's Community Center

Pre-Session Topics of Concern / Questions:

Alternative technologies – What was considered in the FS?

Birds that feed on fish – Were the risks posed to these birds considered in the risk assessment?

Current state at Portland Harbor – Are there still polluters out there?

EPA internal and external expert reviews – How will the outcomes of these reviews be considered in the LWG-produced FS?

USACOE – What has been the Corps involvement in the Superfund process?

Questions Posed During Session:

What guidance(s) did EPA provide to the LWG for their use in developing the FS?

What process was followed to select and approve the early actions work completed to date?

What levels of COIs and/or criteria were used to determine the need for early actions work completed to date?

What is the definition of imminent and substantial endangerment and is guidance available?

How many total COIs have been looked at over the entire site?

Were PCBS considered as endocrine disruptors for river mammals (ie., otters, etc.)?

Do PCBs bioaccumulate in animals?

How did EPA derive the fish consumption numbers used in the human-health risk assessment? Note: Statement made that these numbers are unrealistic.

What about the risks to current workers exposed to the environment at the Portland Harbor? Note: Statement made that worker's comp claims have occurred and continue to occur for Harbor-area employees.

Who is polluting the river now?

What is meant by background and how do you define background?

On the LWG "RALs slide", why do some COCs have "NA" instead of a numerical value?

For lower PCBs RAL values, will the area needing cleanup expand in size versus the areas for cleanup of higher RALs values?

If you clean up PCBs to some low RAL, does that mean that you will get rid of the DDx and other COCs without numerical RALs (ie., "NA" in the RALs table)?

What are CADs and CDFs?

On the LWG “Alternatives slide”, what are the units for the in-situ treatment areas?

Statement made that how and where you measure MNR are key factors for consideration in determining the actual effectiveness of MNR.

For how long would a CDF need to be monitored?

How would caps be monitored for effectiveness?

How can visual monitoring of a cap provide any indication of what is happening with the COCs?

Statement made that there is a possibility to obtain variances in the in-water work window to increase the working season for remedial action implementation.

Statement made that there are techniques available to reduce the suspension of solids in the dredging process.

Does the FS determine the party responsible for the actual remedial action implementation costs?

What was the timescale taken into account in the determination of longterm effectiveness?

How were monitoring costs calculated for the various alternatives?

Do the cost estimates include any monies for financial assurance in the event that an implemented remedial action fails?

How were the navigational channel area requirements (ie., depth) taken into account in the FS alternatives development?

Does the FS include an evaluation of innovative technologies?

Session was formally ended at 8:15 pm but unrecorded questioning on the FS to the LWG reps continued by CAG members.

QUESTIONS from 2nd PUBLIC DRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY INFORMATION SESSION

April 12, 2012, Portland Building Auditorium

Was bioremediation considered in FS?

What innovative technologies were considered?

What are the endocrine disruptors for children from PCBs?

How much deeper will navigable channel be dredged?

Who pays for cleanup?

Was sediment washing considered?

How is it possible that all of the alternatives in the FS will get to same level of cleanup?

Provide clarity on natural recovery vs. active intervention?

What is the time from that each remedial goal will be reached?

What are the ecological receptors?

Do crayfish concentrate chemicals at a higher level than fish?

QUESTIONS from 3rd PUBLIC DRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY INFORMATION SESSION

April 18 (June Key Delta Center)

Pre-Session Topics of Concern / Questions:

PRPs – What is being done to get non-LWG parties involved in the cleanup of the site?

COCs – Is EPA making sure that all of the contamination at the site will be addressed?

FS Report – Does one really have to read all 8000 pages to get an understanding of the potential remedies for the site?

Questions Posed During Session:

When EPA completes an exposure assessment, do you take into account that people may have increased activity (ie., exposures) as the river is being cleaned and deemed safer?

Was an ecological risk assessment completed?

What are the potential risks for the higher-level species (eg., mink)?

What is the outcome (eg., death) of the potential risks to higher-level species?

How often is the site-specific status information tied to the uplands site map at the DEQ website updated?

How many of the uplands sites currently have agreements in place with DEQ to evaluate source control needs?

Are the site-specific priority levels provided on the uplands site map at the DEQ website up to date?

How many upland sites still have problems that can impact the river?

Do the companies located along the river remove tires that were put in place to control erosion from their sites?

What impacts to the river can be caused by the old tires noted above?

Can you explain the various components/processes involved in MNR?

How often is the navigation channel dredged?

Where was the maintenance dredging performed?

What was done with the dredged materials from the maintenance dredging?

How are the data for the various projects (ie., uplands and FS work) acquired and by whom to assure that the data are comparable?

What are the differences in data collected for the DEQ and LWG work?

How do you determine a sitewide concentration for a COC?

Does the determination of a sitewide concentration include the navigation channel?

Who would be involved with the oversight of dredging work if it goes on for 30 years USACOE?

Would the USACOE do some of the dredging work for the site cleanup?

Statement made that most of the PRPs are currently in negotiations to determine the allocation of remedy costs at the site.

Does EPA expect that the allocation negotiations will be completed to meet their schedules for remedial actions?

What dredging methods are considered in the FS?

Why does it take so much longer to clean up to the lower RALs?

Where did the three dredging projects per year assumption come from?

Why wouldn't all of the "r" alternatives score higher than "i" alternatives because more dredging should have greater longterm effectiveness?

If the COCs are capped, wouldn't there still be a risk for release of COCs over the long term?

Did EPA suggest the numerical model that was used and has said model been applied at other Superfund sites?

What is the projected average sitewide PCB concentration after 45 years for Alternative A?

Why is sitewide average a level appropriate for consideration in determining the amount of materials for cleanup?

Could EPA select different alternatives for different areas within the river?

Is the river currently clean enough for people to swim in it?

QUESTIONS from 4th PUBLIC DRAFT FEASIBILITY STUDY INFORMATION SESSION

MAY 10, 2012 (Ecotrust Building)

Pre-Session Topics of Concern / Questions:

Remedial Alternatives – Where on the internet can you find further information on the options being considered for the Portland Harbor cleanup?

Risks Posed – What are the greatest human-health concerns from contamination at Portland Harbor?

Questions Posed During Session:

What do the acronyms “PCBs” and “PAHs” stand for?

How did EPA determine the spatial extent of the Portland Harbor Superfund Site?

Is the information on the DEQ online map update to date?

Is most of the ongoing contamination coming from the existing industrial sites?

USA Today has been running stories on lead issues: is this a concern for the Portland Harbor uplands source control work?

Have the various drainages that provide surface-water inflows to the Willamette River been looked at during the studies that have been completed to date?

Have studies been done to determine potential sources of contamination upriver of the Portland Harbor Site?

Has any testing been done in neighborhoods adjacent to the Portland Harbor Site to assess presence/absence of COIs?

What is the basis for selecting the 75-ppb level for PCBs in the FS as the cutoff for cleanup at the Site?

Statement made that environmental sampling was completed in the Multnomah Channel. (The figure being shown at the time does not show results in this area.)

Was the risk from the release of radiological compounds from the Japan earthquake assessed in the Portland Harbor studies?

Are hot spots of COIs present where swimming in the area could be an issue of concern?

Statement made that there are some advisories in place regarding specific river uses.

What are the risks posed by the various COIs at the Site?

Can you explain what a “non-cancer risk” is?

Alternatives Slide: What is meant by “Use of CADs or CDFs”?

Statement made that the Port has proposed building a CDF at Portland Harbor and info on this is available at their website.

What type of bucket would be used for dredging work?

Did you consider recommending trial testing of various dredging technologies for the FS?

Statement made that there are permitted landfills where the dredged sediment can be disposed of.

What was the basis for the comparative scoring of the alternatives evaluation criteria in the FS?

Are any of the alternatives evaluation criteria weighted higher than the others in the comparative analysis in the FS?

Has an evaluation been completed of the people who use the river for various recreational uses where a potential threat is posed by COIs from the Site?